

Application of: Peter Arthur Tobler, et al.
Serial No.: 10/708,146
Amendment B

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1 and FIG. 24. Replacement sheet 1 of 2, which includes FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1 and FIG. 2. In FIG. 1, previously omitted element label 10 has been added and the typo has been corrected. Replacement sheet 2 of 2, which includes FIG. 23 and FIG. 24, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 23 and FIG. 24. In FIG. 24, the arrows for the element labels 532, 530 and 528 have been corrected.

Attachments: Replacement sheets of drawings
Annotated sheets of drawings showing changes.

REMARKS

Responsive to the Examiner's finding of a defective Declaration. The perceived strike-out alterations are in fact not strike-outs and are not intended as such, but the stray lines must have occurred during the electronic filing process or in the scanning/copying process. The zip codes and country for Inventors eleven and thirteen remain as originally typed with no alterations. Responsive to the drawing objections, either the drawing has been amended as noted herein and/or the specification has been amended to overcome the objections. Paragraphs of the specification have been amended as noted herein to address the formality objection. No new matter has been added by the drawing amendments or the specification amendments. Claims 1 – 61 are pending in the present application and all claims stand objected to and/or rejected for multiple reasons. Responsive to the objections and rejections, amendments to the claims have been made as set forth herein.

Specifically claims 1, 2, 18, 20, 22, 25, 34, 37, and 48 – 61 have been amended as noted herein to overcome the objections for informalities related to antecedent basis.

Regarding the 112 rejections to claims 6, 22, 36, 50, 56, and 59 relating to the use of the term “zero tolerance”, the term “zero tolerance” is a term well known by those skilled in the art area and is a term originating from standards in the industry such as for example the ISO 9000 standard series. Thus, no further definition is required. The term refers to a requirement that has no latitude for tolerance. For example in the food industry, certain type of contamination is

wholly unacceptable even in small quantities. A specific example is severance of spinal cord material in the red meat processing industry.

Regarding the 112 rejections for vague and indefinite to claims 5, 4-18, 26 -29, 33, 36, 38 – 40, 44, 45, 54, 55 and 59, claims 44, 45 and 59 have been cancelled. The remaining claims rejected in the paragraph have been amended as noted herein to overcome the vague and indefiniteness rejection.

Regarding the non-statutory rejections under 101 for claims 1-32, 48-54 and 58, the claims have been amended adding the step of correlating has been specifically recited and an additional step of displaying the correlating data has been added to overcome the 101 rejection.

Regarding the anticipation and obvious rejection under 102 and 103 each of the independent claims recites correlating product quality control measurement data to at least one part. None of the references taken individually or collectively anticipate, teach or suggest this limitation in combination with the other limitations, thus the references cited do not anticipate or render obvious the independent claims or the dependent claims depending therefrom.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the application as amended is in condition for allowance including all remaining claims and respectfully request that all remaining claims be allowed to proceed to issuance. Specifically the informalities have been corrected and the references cited do not anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed.

Application of: Peter Arthur Tobler, et al.
Serial No.: 10/708,146
Amendment B

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Jan 11, '07

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mark E. Stallion", written over a horizontal line.

Mark E. Stallion

Reg. No. 46,132

Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP

720 Olive Street, Suite 2400

St. Louis, MO 63101

314-345-6000

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT